



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of an interview, made through D'Oysell in 1561, on condition that Mary should ratify the treaty of Edinburgh? Lang maintains that she "threw away this admirable chance of settling the feud"; Henderson argues strongly, perhaps convincingly, to the contrary. It is their most important disagreement—although Henderson's unusually favorable view of Maitland diverges widely from Lang's, and his absolute belief in Mary's guilt and the authenticity of the Glasgow Letter leads him to subject Lang's theories to a searching examination in an appendix. Second, was the Darnley marriage inevitable? On this crucial point Henderson and Hume are at variance, the former maintaining that Mary was never in love with Darnley and that passion did not supersede ambition as a motive-force until after Riccio's murder, when political exigencies, combined with an irresistible reaction from hopes irretrievably ruined, threw her into Bothwell's arms. Hume's argument (*The Love Affairs of Mary Queen of Scots*, 225–226) is the more convincing, and, if true, makes Mary the wilful architect of her own ruin by voluntarily accepting a chance. Third, was Mary's Catholicizing policy after the Chase-About Raid forced upon her? Could Maitland's policy have been successful? If not, would Mary have necessarily lost more than the gratification of her English ambitions? Fourth, was the Bothwell marriage necessitated? Henderson does not prove it, and Hume's argument (*op. cit.*, 7–9), that Mary's ultimate ruin was caused rather by the permanence given Bothwell's power than by her mere complicity in Darnley's murder, is very cogent.

The illustrations in the book are notable for the completeness of their range, rather than for their artistic value. Individually they are excelled in this respect by the illustrations in Lang's *The Mystery of Mary Stuart* and in the Goupil edition of Sir John Skelton's *Mary Stuart*. In at least two instances—Knox, from Beza's *Icones*: and Mary, from the picture in the possession of the Earl of Morton—Henderson has assigned them to wrong originals.

O. H. RICHARDSON.

Scotland and the Union: a History of Scotland from 1695 to 1747.

By WILLIAM LAW MATHIESON. (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons. 1905. Pp. xiii, 387.)

THE present volume is designed as "a continuation, on a broader and more comprehensive plan", of Mr. Mathieson's *Politics and Religion*, published in 1902. Strictly speaking, however, it is not a comprehensive history of Scotland during the period covered. The whole treatment centres about the Union, with the main emphasis on its political aspects. Industrial and religious questions are dealt with only so far as they relate to the main theme. Yet, although the author regards the material side of the subject as the more important, and devotes nearly three-quarters of his space to it, his chapters on the church constitute his most novel and interesting contribution.

This is due to the fact that in tracing the history of the purely political and economic aspects of the Union Mr. Mathieson has had to traverse a path already blazed by Dr. James Mackinnon in his *Union of England and Scotland*, which appeared in 1896. While the present author has used some new material and has apparently worked independently, for he nowhere mentions his predecessor, he does not seem to have superseded the latter in any essential features. Notwithstanding, Mr. Mathieson's pre-eminent merits deserve recognition, his acute and profound reflections, his vivid characterizations, his grasp of material, and his absolute impartiality. While he understands his people and sympathizes with their aspirations, he holds no brief for them. For instance, he recognizes evidences of self-seeking in Paterson that Dr. Mackinnon would not see (pp. 35-36, 56), and is much more reasonable in his discussion of charges of bribery against certain members of the Scotch parliament of 1706 (p. 143). Moreover, he is able to see across the border, and his estimate of King William's attitude toward Scotch affairs is very just.

Although there are many pages of vigorous and vivacious writing, much of the book is very hard reading. Many things are alluded to or taken for granted which call for fuller explanation. For example, a description of the form of government in Scotland at the time of the Union and an account of the principles and aims of the court, country, and Jacobite parties when they first appear would have been welcome. Then, to be more minute, we are not told (p. 277) how Scotch traders expected to evade the tobacco duty by shipping tobacco from England and sending it back again, and (p. 90) the cause of Simon Fraser's flight to France, as stated, is a little misleading. The difficulty of reading is not infrequently due to cumbersome and involved sentences, and, occasionally, the author is a bit careless about the placing of his clauses. On page 48 we are told that members of the crew of a certain vessel "went into the hold to draw brandy with a lighted candle".

The risings of 1715 and 1745 are, of course, sketched only briefly, but the long and complicated negotiations leading to the Union are discussed in detail, new material being introduced to illustrate the arguments for and against the measure. By an analysis of the addresses sent to the Scottish parliament in the autumn of 1706 Mr. Mathieson is inclined to think "that a very large section of the middle and lower classes was decidedly hostile to the Union, and that a more important, if a smaller, section was disposed to hold aloof" (p. 132), and, by an examination of the division lists, he concludes (p. 143) that the parliamentary majority in its favor was drawn "in overwhelming numbers" from the first estate—chiefly nobles under English influence. The apparent paradox that the sentiment of nationality, "which had proved its efficacy as a motive of separation, was to be equally efficacious as an incentive to union" (pp. 155-156) is lucidly explained. His predecessor had already pointed out the importance of the "New Party" or "Squadrone" in

determining the result. Commercial considerations are adequately considered, and the author confirms, with some additional evidence, Dr. Mackinnon's gloomy picture of the material conditions of the country during the forty years following 1707. This is all the more interesting since Dr. Mackinnon's views on this point have been challenged by at least one competent Scottish historian. In the three chapters on the church Mr. Mathieson is on ground where he is *facile princeps*. Most excellent are the accounts of the rise of latitudinarianism, the strife over clerical appointments, the intrusion of methodistical enthusiasm, the secessions, and all else that vexed the repose of rigid orthodoxy.

The statements of fact to which one might take exception are few and unimportant. In speaking of the final negotiation for the Union as the third (p. 110) the author must leave out of account that under Cromwell, who, if he forced his measure on the Scots, at least went through the form of having commissioners appointed. In stating that Walpole resigned in February, 1742, on "finding that his majority had almost disappeared" (p. 341), he seems to ignore the well-known fact that the Government had been actually defeated in the vote on the Chippenham elections. Again, perhaps it is hardly correct to speak of the "discoveries" of Vasco da Gama (p. 342). Although he opened the trade-route from Portugal to India, Diaz had already rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and the waters over which he sailed thence were already familiar to Mohammedan traders. But after all has been said the book forms a welcome addition to a most important phase of British history.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

The Old Colonial System. By GERALD BERKELEY HERTZ, M.A., B.C.L., Lecturer on Constitutional Law. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, No. III.] (Manchester: At the University Press. 1905. Pp. xi, 232.)

THIS very enlightening discussion of "the causes, character and results of Great Britain's old colonial system" is timely; for it supplements in a remarkable way the recent researches of several other writers in the same field. The author's conclusions rest upon a more sustained and critical examination of the "immense storehouses of the writings of the day", particularly the controversial pamphlet literature produced in the British isles, than hitherto has been made. The mercantile imperial theory appears clearly as the primary cause of the separation of the colonies; and in this regard Mr. Hertz's conclusions are in sharp contrast to the views of some recent writers in the United States, who are almost inclined to view that theory as a deterrent rather than a provocative of revolution.

Under the old régime there was no conscious oppression, no deliberate malice. "In actual fact, the old colonial policy was based upon the very sensible ideal of a self-sufficing empire. That ideal was applied with a selfish bias by British ministers" (p. 38); but it was a